

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. The indication of allowability of dependent claims 4-6 and 26-28 is appreciated. These claims have been rewritten into independent form and should be in clear condition for allowance.

It would be appreciated if the next USPTO Office Action would acknowledge that the formal drawings submitted on September 8, 2001 are acceptable.

The rejection of claims 1, 7, 23 and 29 as being anticipated by Ulke (U.S. Patent No. 3,983,427) is traversed. Ulke does not disclose a winding support extending between opposite sides of the winding as recited in claim 1. The bolt shown in Figure 1 of Ulke which is represented in the Action as being a "winding support" does not support the windings and does not extend between opposite sides of the winding. Moreover, threaded bolt shown in Figure 1 of Ulke is not a winding support. Rather, the bolt holds together the sections of the rotor core 12.

Claim 1 has been amended to state that "opposite ends of said winding support attached to the coil winding". The ends of the bolt shown in Ulke do not attach to the coil winding and do not extend between opposite sides of the winding as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, there is no anticipation of claim 1.

With respect to dependent claim 7, Ulke also does not show a tie rod extending through a plurality of core sections, wherein the tie rod is different from the coil winding. In Ulke, if the bolt is to be treated as the coil winding support, then it has no tie rod.

Conversely, if the bolt is treated as a tie rod, then Ulke does not disclose or suggest a winding support. In either view of the Ulke bolt, claim 7 is not anticipated.

The rejection of independent claim 23 as being anticipated by Ulke is traversed for similar reasons as is stated above with respect to claim 1. Claim 23 states that opposite ends of the winding support are attached to opposite sides of the winding. The bolt shown in Ulke does not have opposite ends that are attached to opposite sides of the winding. Similarly, dependent claim 29 is not anticipated for substantially the same reasons as stated above with respect to dependent claim 7. Accordingly, all anticipation rejections should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 8-10 and 30-32 as being obvious over Ulke in view of Wang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,570,292 - Wang '292) is traversed for substantially the same reasons as stated above. Dependent claims 8-10 depend on claim 1 and dependent claims 30-32 depend on independent claim 23. If independent claims 1 and 23 are allowable for the reasons stated above, then so should be their dependent claims.

Further, Wang '292 is 102(e) prior art to this application and may not be applied to support an obviousness rejection. See 35 U.S.C. §103(c). Wang '292 is commonly owned by the General Electric Company with this application. Further, Wang '292 was first published on November 21, 2002, several months after the filing of this application and is therefore not 102(b) prior art. As 102(e) prior art, Wang may not be applied to support an obviousness rejection of this application which is commonly owned with Wang '292. 35 U.S.C. §103(c). Accordingly, the obviousness rejection should be

Yu WANG
Appl. No. 09/935,735
August 21, 2003

withdrawn because Wang '292 is not properly applied to support an obviousness rejection.


The rejection of dependent claims 2, 3, 24 and 25 as being obvious over Ulke in view of El-Antably (U.S. Patent No. 5,296,773) is traversed. The rejection of these dependent claims should be withdrawn for substantially the same reasons as is stated above with respect to the allowability of their independent claims 1 and 23 over Ulke. Further, the rejection does not describe how El-Antably is being applied. It is also not apparent from a review of El-Antably how it could be applied to support an obviousness rejection. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 2, 3, 24 and 25 should be withdrawn because no prima facie case of obviousness has been stated in the Office Action for these claims.

All claims are in good condition for allowance. If any small matter remains outstanding, the Examiner is requested to telephone applicants' attorney. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of this application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____


Jeffrey H. Nelson
Reg. No. 30,481

JHN:glf
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201-4714
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100